

R E M A R K S

Claims 1, 3-15, 17-22 and 24-33 are pending; claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 15 and 28 have been amended; claims 2, 16 and 23 have been canceled and claims 29-33 have been added. Claims 29-32 are supported by original claims 3, 6, 15 and 28 respectively.

The allowance of claims 4, 7, 10, 11, 15, 19, 20 and 26 is acknowledged with appreciation.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 12-14, 16 and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

While claim 1 does not define "parent structure", the term is defined in the specification on pages 16-21. It is well settled by the courts that applicants may be their own lexicographer In re Hill 73 USPQ 482 (CCPA 1947). Thus, one has only to look to the specification for the definition of "parent structure".

The characterizations of the parent structure in claims 12-14, especially claim 14 are definite since they are recognizable materials. New claim 33 is clearly definite since these are art recognized terms.

The subject matter of claim 8 is explained on pages 20 and 21 of the specification. The parent structure may carry lateral reactive functional groups (e) which are able to undergo radically, ionically and/or thermally initiated crosslinking reactions with reactive functional groups (e) of their own kind or with other complementary functional groups (f). The complementary functional groups e) and f) may be present in one and the same parent structure which is the case with what are known as self-crosslinking systems. Alternatively, the functional groups (f) may be

BLUM et al., Ser. No. 10/089,171

present in another constituent, materially different from the solid of the invention, an example being a crosslinking agent which is the case with what are known as externally crosslinking-systems. They are selected so as not to disrupt, let alone prevent entirely the actinic radiation initiated polymerization or crosslinking reaction of the double bonds of the groups (a). This means that the functional groups e) and f) are not one of the functional groups (a).

The rejection of claims 16 and 23 is moot since they have been canceled.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 17, 18, 21-25, 27 and 28 stand rejected as anticipated by Morgan (U.S. 4,017,371).

This rejection is now not applicable since the subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated into claim 1. Thus, for one thing, the prior art fails to teach chemically bonded stabilizers.

Applicants would like to make of record related commonly assigned application Serial No. 10/089,173 which is directed to solid compositions which contain bonds that can be activated with actinic radiation and comprise at least two materially different compounds.

Favorable action by the examiner is solicited.

BLUM et al., Ser. No. 10/089,171

Respectfully submitted,

KEIL & WEINKAUF



Edward J. Smith
Reg. No. 24,074

1350 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

(202)659-0100